

Review Form 3

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Biotechnology and Bioresource Technology
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJB2T_121211
Title of the Manuscript:	Stachys byzantina: Nutritional Value, Culinary Potential, and Sustainability of an Unconventional Food Plant
Type of the Article	Review Article

General guidelines for the Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guidelines for the Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

<https://r1.reviewerhub.org/general-editorial-policy/>

Important Policies Regarding Peer Review

Peer review Comments Approval Policy: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/peer-review-comments-approval-policy/>

Benefits for Reviewers: <https://r1.reviewerhub.org/benefits-for-reviewers>

Review Form 3

PART 1: Review Comments

Compulsory REVISION comments	Reviewer's comment	Author's Feedback <i>(Please correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Please write a few sentences regarding the importance of this manuscript for the scientific community. Why do you like (or dislike) this manuscript? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	The article is very significant to the scientific community. The manuscript is liked because it provides data for further scientific researches. It also give a baseline nutritional information into the food chain.	
Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)	Nutritional Value, Culinary Potential and Sustainability of Stachys byzantina: an Unconventional Food Plant	
Is the abstract of the article comprehensive? Do you suggest the addition (or deletion) of some points in this section? Please write your suggestions here.	Abstract is satisfactory.	
Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?	No. They're not appropriate.	
Please write a few sentences regarding the scientific correctness of this manuscript. Why do you think that this manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound? A minimum of 3-4 sentences may be required for this part.	As stated previously.	
Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestions of additional references, please mention them in the review form. :	References too few. More review advised. No consistency in the referencing. Some authors names are in upper case while some are in lowercases. Only First letter of authors names should be in Cap letters then others should be in small letters. Similarly, reference numbers 6 to 15 should be cited in the text. Above all, it is advised that the author/authors use APA citation and referencing format.	
<u>Minor</u> REVISION comments Is the language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?	The language quality is scholarly communication and suitable.	
<u>Optional/General</u> comments	The authors should use APA citation format. Except stated otherwise by the Journal guidelines. Reference number should be removed from the text and replace with authors. Journals articles with three or more authors are properly cited in the text. Generally, consistency should be maintained.	

Review Form 3

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment <i>(if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)</i>
Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?	<i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i>	

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Ntinya Mbuotidem Usen
Department, University & Country	University of Calabar, Nigeria